

## **Conservation Commission, June 13, 2011**

Town of Scituate  
Conservation Commission  
Town Hall Selectmen's Hearing Room  
Meeting Minutes  
June 13, 2011

Meeting was called to order 6:15 at p.m.

Members Present: Mr. Snow, Chairman, Mr. Jones, Mr. Greenbaum, Ms. Scott-Pipes, Mr. Tufts

Also Present: Paul Shea, Agent, Jim O'Connell, Agent, and Carol Logue, Secretary,

Agenda: Motion to accept the agenda Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Show Cause Hearing: Carey/Northern Construction, 138 Edward Foster Rd (destruction of dune)  
Jim Carey, 138 Edward Foster Rd, Erik Rahkonen, and Jack Graves from Northern Construction were present at the hearing. Mr. O'Connell: Northern Construction met with Mr. Carey who agreed to allow access over his property. The reason for this hearing is unauthorized access over a dune for repair of a town revetment on 2nd Cliff. Dune and vegetation destroyed. Town issued contract to Northern to repair revetment on 1st and 2nd cliff. Mr. Carey: Northern came and asked if they could cross my property; it was and is the intention to restore the beach grass, also to regrade to prior state; will replant sea grass as early as possible in October, it was in the best interest of everyone involved to allow this. Ms. Scott-Pipes: the bottom line is in order to do anything on those dunes need Commission approval; Commission didn't know anything about it; must have a restoration plan in place. Mr. Greenbaum: should be directed to Northern Construction. Did you get a copy of the Order of Conditions? Yes. How did you miss the fact that you needed to come back if there were any changes. Had trouble getting in touch with Jim O'Connell;

project is supervised by DPW and outside engineer reviewing the work, with Town doing day-to-day inspections. Kevin Cafferty: they are on site once a week. Mr. O'Connell: Didn't know about it until we got a call that someone was going over the dune; total breakdown in communication with basically 2 people supervising the project and not all the Orders being followed by the contractor; access shut down as of last Friday. Abutters allowed access for a few extra days. Mr. Jones: there was an access previously approved by ConCom? Yes. Reiterate what Mr. Greenbaum said, it is unfortunate that the town was put in this position. Mr. Shea: the approved site plans were produced by Vine Associates--did you ever call Peter Williams and tell him the access wouldn't work? Submitted changes to DPW and Vine Associates. What would make you think you didn't have to go back to DEP and ConCom. Tried to stop by office a few times. Need to talk to the entire Commission. If not following that plan and you made changes, you have to talk to DEP Southeast Region and the Commission. Do you do many coastal projects? Just finished a job in Marshfield. The project engineer who stamped the plan would guide you back here. He is liable for that plan that hasn't been approved by the state or town. Mr. O'Connell: to summarize--only other access is over the unvegetated dune at Peggotty Beach; the project is almost done, FEMA monies that have to be used, and possible early storms; gave an Emergency Certificate to access that portion of the beach; received a brief restoration plan regarding the dune this morning; think they knew they were going to access there many months ago; want a sketch of what is going to be put on the dune--would like to see a mix on the back side of the dune: Beach plum, rosa rugosa, etc. and more of an explanation of the restoration plan. Mr. Snow: You take another engineer's plan and modify it for the restoration plan; we want someone qualified to do this restoration plan; just trying to show area disturbed and square footage of what would be replaced; thinks the Commission has been extremely cooperative; we would like to see this corrected. Carey has a place where his wall is damaged. Assume we are going to get some sort of plan for seawall work and restoration plan from a qualified person. Proposing to use the same plan, unless you need a site-specific plan showing the stones. Need a larger scale plan showing vegetation for the unauthorized use of dune. Additional work to 1st cliff the town wants addressed. The sand needs to be stabilized. Could be

mulch or biodegradable mats. Native salt tolerant plants could be put on the backside. Would like to have that done soon. Restoration plan was due to be in hands before work is done. Mr. Carey: will restore grass in October. If something more elaborate is required, then will have to get together with Northern. Something has to be done before September or October so sand doesn't just blow off the property. Reasonable request for a restoration plan; good faith effort before going back and working on the wall.

Show Cause Hearing: Bang, 23 Alden Ave./aka 49 Seaside Road (alteration)

Jens Bang and Mr. Totman were present at the hearing. Mr. Tufts received an anonymous call about wetlands disturbed and material being hauled away. Cleared out area across Alden Ave. Talked to company and neighbor briefly. Stopped the contractor, who knew he shouldn't be doing it. Mr. Bang did considerable work with ConCom in the past. Had considerable storm damage. Lost 5 cars. Over the years has just been phragmites, dead undergrowth, as a result of the storms, had heard it used to be a small pond. Over the years silted in, beach stones, very dense, tremendous amount of poison ivy. Everything migrates into this area, logs, etc. Abutters just wanted to clean up the area. Had Mr. Totman scrape off all the dead material, no digging, no movement of sea grass. Left all the trees. Wanted to make the neighborhood look better. Attempt was to clean it up and let the natural vegetation grow back. Ms. Scott-Pipes: admit you have dealt with ConCom before; don't do anything until you get permission. When we cut our beach roses down, as well as sea grass, they come in thicker. Kevin Tufts: don't understand, you dealt with Conservation before. We didn't do any digging. All three abutters agreed it was an eyesore. Mr. Totman didn't tell you to come to ConCom? Quite clear that if he had to dig, he wouldn't do it. Mr. Greenbaum: according to Google earth, as of last summer that piece of property didn't have much debris. Will allow phragmites eradication and restoration. Contractor knew perfectly well he shouldn't have touched it; he should be held responsible. This isn't the first time. Should bring him in at a separate meeting. Phragmites and poison ivy will come back. Mr. O'Connell: Could you plant salt tolerant plants? Plenty of dirt there. Nothing has been removed or added. Need some sort of restoration plan to keep

the debris from flowing in there. Would you be willing to put together some sort of plan? Mr. Jones: Situation obviously would have been easily taken care of if you'd come to the Commission first. Had a machine, didn't go in by hand. Mr. Snow: should have filed an RDA. Willing to work with you, but more work could have been done by hand. At the same time probably would have requested some sort of phragmites eradication plan. Could file a NOI for a maintenance plan. Would like something filed. Not in favor of phragmites, it is an invasive, consult with someone knowledgeable. Combine planting plan and NOI for maintenance.

Show Cause Hearing: Tibbetts/LEC, 117-119 Edward Foster Rd  
(Scituate Marine Park - variations at site)

Stan Humphries, LEC Environmental and George Block, Tibbetts Engineering were present at the hearing. Commission was not made aware of a preconstruction meeting until after the fact. Went out to look at site, silt fence was 4' into the salt marsh. Whoever graded the embankment didn't know that it was a salt marsh. Stopped any more work on the slope. Asked if contractor had Orders on site to see if the Commission allowed salt marsh fill. Looked at the files; the Orders were issued in 2008 and extended to 2013. Don't even have the correct plans. Had a site visit--Tibbetts overseeing the entire project. An abutter also came who had the old plan: the walkway is not in the same location. At the present time, do not have updated plans that are being used. Asked them to pull fill out of the salt marsh, don't know how much salt marsh is filled. Moved silt fence and straw bales up the slope. Asked to explain why Commission doesn't have the updated plans. Under a cease and desist. George Block, principle in the firm and on this project: Apologize to the Commission for not meeting expectations in many ways. Preconstruction inadvertently left ConCom off the list. Placement of silt fence was not something noticed. When project and Orders were reviewed, thought the changes weren't significant, could be handled on an as-built plan. In retrospect that thinking was wrong. Believe the changes made have less impact, major reason for not speaking with the Commission. Stan Humphries, LEC, indicated the same apology, breakdown in communication. Hope can work with staff for the salt marsh and coastal bank restoration. Agree with George the impacts of the project are a lot less than what

was proposed. Extensive planting plan. Propose at this time silt fence and haybales. Will find extent of fill, remove by hand and allow 2 week period for regrowth or replant if necessary. Coastal bank is not stable right now. Continue with revegetation. Pier is no longer part of the project, but at least agree the major components of the plans are the same. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Don't think DEP knows anything about this. Mr. Loring, abutter: the walkway on the northern side of the parking lot is not where the plans showed it would be; reviewed the plans, thought project was a good idea, was behind it; find it so upsetting to see fill in the salt marsh, grass covered, walkway not the same material approved; better or not, it is not the same--states in the Orders any change requires notification to ConCom; problems could possibly have been avoided. Preconstruction included Harbormaster, DPW, and Waterways, how could ConCom be left out? Now it is a mess, a lot that has to be corrected; walkway is definitely on the property line. Take time to look at the plans and decide what we will and won't accept. Mr. Greenbaum: Went through the Orders – out of 31 orders, 19 were violated. Did you read the OofC? No reports have been submitted. As a professional engineer, embarrassed by peers, as a taxpayer, feel cheated. An engineer hired by the town should do the job correctly. Agent's time is very valuable. To have him and Commission members tied up at meetings constantly shouldn't be happening. Mr. Jones: Just don't understand how a professional can do what has been reportedly done; how could Scituate allow you to work on other projects in this town, but that is not my purview. Mr. Loring: concerned about flooding, supported this financially and have been to all the meetings. Filled in the boatyard with yards of material. Was told don't worry, would have a buffer and don't worry about the marsh. Asked why material was being removed from the marsh. Was told they had to get down to something hard. This is going to be like concrete. I can't believe this is happening. Should be a buffer and there should be a swale. Dropped off pictures. Everywhere the walkway went is completely flooded; compacted raw gravel.. Mr. Shea: The Commission needs to review any revised plans. Applicant just needed to come before Commission and DEP, alteration into the salt marsh triggers other agencies - Corps of Engineers for one. Continue the hearing and look at the plan and have LEC go out. Mr. Bjorklund: heard a number of things about preconstruction, whatever happens with DPW has nothing to do with a preconstruction

with Conservation; it is the meeting with contractor, agent, and owner, a whole different meeting. Mr. Snow: if this were a job that we felt was malicious, without any regard for Orders, we would look at leveling fines and/or other actions; however, as people transition and engineers transition, very wrong plans and orders were followed; more important now is the salt marsh; come back to us and say where you think you are; don't know if we need a new filing, but this needs to be corrected. Not sure we are satisfied with the temporary support of that bank. Immediate action, aside from reviewing plans, address slope stabilization and marsh fill. Will have discussion tomorrow. There is a potential to pull fill back by hand, without destroying vegetation. Meet ASAP to stabilize embankment. Want to know it is stabilized properly. Stan Humphries and Jim O'Connell will devise a plan of how to move forward. Next meeting will need to know if altering this plan or if there will be an amendment. Mr. Loring: go back to original plans all the agencies saw, they all thought it was a great idea to have a buffer and swale; cement walk should go back to the original plan; why would that change, when it was approved by all? Mr. Snow: Significant items won't be approved, take a hard look at what was approved in the beginning and ask why the changes are good. Originally trying to clean up a mess from 50 years ago, somehow gone beyond that. Walkway was changed at the request of Waterways Committee, wanted to relocate away from parking lot; it was their choice. Change was primarily for handicapped access. Have another meeting and make a list of questions. Mr. O'Connell: Any deviation from original plan needs to be addressed. Need to know what has changed and why. Progress report in 2 weeks. Stan should come up with a plan for marsh restoration and, if agreed upon, get the marsh restored. Motion to continue the hearing to June 27, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Whalley, 25 Gilson Rd (10' x 12' shed) Joe Whalley was present at the hearing. Not in 50' buffer. Shed will sit on concrete blocks. Motion for a negative 3 determination - . "The work described in the Request is within the Buffer Zone, as defined in the regulations, but will not alter an Area subject to protection under the Act. Therefore, said work does not require the filing of a Notice of Intent, subject to the following conditions (if any)." Ms. Scott-Pipes.

Second Mr. Tufts. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Request for Determination: Sax, 4 Dickens Row (demo 2 upper floors/ rebuild with small additions)

Julie Sax was present at the hearing. Submitted to Planning Board and have been approved. Mr. Duggan suggested Conservation. Existing foundation, bump out using existing columns. Might have to be one more column dug for the deck. Motion for a negative 3 determination - "The work described in the Request is within the Buffer Zone, as defined in the regulations, but will not alter an Area subject to protection under the Act. Therefore, said work does not require the filing of a Notice of Intent, subject to the following conditions (if any)." Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Tufts. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Perry, 105 Gilson Rd (raze/rebuild) (cont.)

Josh Bows, Merrill Associates, and George and Laurie Perry were present at the hearing. During the last month have been working with agent. Commission's concern has been the location of house and distance from cliff. Agreed to move back 23' from the cliff with added mitigation. No further testing required. New plan incorporates those changes. Ms. Scott-Pipes: glad house was moved back, wish you'd gone back further, but do like the double row of rosa rugosa. Mr. Shea: Said they didn't have to do any other geotechnical work if the house was moved back 25' from coastal bank. Eliminates wall issue, creates a 23' setback with the plantings. No letter from engineer indicating the stability of the bank. Biggest thing is precipitation that erodes a coastal bank. Mr. Jones: foundation on existing house, will it be removed with an excavator? Should be no impact on the bank. Existing patio will be pulled out. Could you leave the existing foundation in the front and just fill it in, so there is no change to ground at all in that area? Josh Bows: Haven't destabilized the bank at all. Fill should be compacted, to him that is more intrusive than removing. Would require too much compaction. Will have to compact what you take out anyway. What are you doing with roof runoff? Two drywells and the driveway runs into a swale and a proposed rain garden at the end of the driveway. All the water will go back toward the garage. Mr. O'Connell has a concern about the removal of the foundation; in other areas required leaving the foundation. Serious problem with the abutter to the south, filed now

for bank stabilization. Mr. Snow: leave the portion of the foundation toward the bank; cut and only remove the foundation where the new foundation has to go. Can do that. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Put in Orders regarding only portion of foundation removal. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Lilly, 147A Border St. (new build & septic) (cont.) Applicant requested a continuance. Motion to continue the hearing to June 27, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: McLaughlin, 234, 238, 240 Central Ave. (rip-rap) (cont.)

Mark McLaughlin was present at the hearing. Plan was submitted the day of the last hearing, that's the only reason applicant is back. Commission is satisfied. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: McNamara, 83 Surfside Rd (replace boulders/bldg. deck/concrete patio & fence) (cont.)

Rick Grady, Grady Consulting, was present at the hearing. Proposing to eliminate the concrete patio. Proposed deck to the rear of house has a gap, constructed on sonotube footings. Would like to install a fence; proposing to remove the jersey barriers on either side of the property. Supplement or refit boulders. Not getting approval for boulder replacement. Would either need a new filing or an amendment. Would need information on the site plan. Remove concrete patio from the plan. Ms. Scott-Pipes: Have no problem with them there. Deck is bigger than previous deck? Plan was revised 505 sq. ft larger. Documented on the revised plan. Mr. Greenbaum: fence for screening? Think it would be a solid fence, perpendicular to the wall. Won't redirect flow. Mr. Jones: Fence will be above the wall, maybe could have some removable panels; it is in an area where it could get hit, maybe make 2 sections removable for winter. Put in the orders have removable panels. Mr. O'Connell: will change velocity and direction of overwash. Fence: 6' high basically batter boards with space between boards. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.



Wetlands Hearing: Boyle, 254 Central Ave. (repair damaged seawall)  
Rosemary Boyle and Kevin Stacey, contractor, were present at the hearing. Seawall repair. Surveyed plan submitted by John Keefe. There is a drill hole in the wall, and the wall is entirely on her property. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Casperson, 53 Lighthouse Rd (deck/flag pole/shower pad/landing/stairs)  
Bob Crawford was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. 2003 there was a filing made to reconstruct dwelling. Asked to prepare a letter to close that file and it was discovered the shed, landing, and deck were a little bigger than on approved plan. Mr. Casperson bought lot and deck went onto abutting lot. Shed is up on posts 11.8' elevation; corner actually goes into the wetland. Entirely in 50' no build zone. Ms. Scott-Pipes: This is an as-built. Couldn't understand shower pad. There was a shed there, they tore it down. There was a rear deck proposed, it wasn't shown on the site plans, but was on the structural plans. Mr. Greenbaum: shower pad 4" concrete. He is reclaiming marshland, remind the applicant to honor his property line and existing wetlands; do not try to make more lawn. Mr. Jones: Would it do any good to install a fence? Mr. O'Connell: Scott's point is well taken. Wetland line is flagged, at least half the property has a substantial area of wetland that is being mowed. Site is all phrag. If he doesn't mow it, it will all turn into phragmites. There is a 4' section of marsh grass. Mr. Shea: when phrag comes right up to the house, very dangerous if there is ever a fire. Suggest mowing a shorter distance from the house. Possibly put a boundary, a buffer of 10'. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Tufts. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Joy, 262 Central Ave. (replace leaching field & rip-rap boulders)  
Rick Grady, Grady Consulting, was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Rip-rap boulders were set; this was under an emergency order. Mr. O'Connell: do you have a bulkhead behind or between 2 vertical seawalls? Can't build a stand-alone revetment.

Understanding was they built exactly what was there. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Blaney, 274 Central Ave. (septic & rip-rap protection)

Bob Crawford, E.E.T., Inc., and Mr. & Mrs. Blaney were present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Dec. 2010 storm took out septic pits. While doing investigation, it was discovered that the existing pit and leaching were both in the water table. New leaching required. Proposing to replace both pits, a 405 sq ft area of leaching systems and installing a pump tank. Prior to the storm, beach stone was up to elevation 13' or 14'. Restore a lot of material under the house between piles. Also proposing quarry stone in front of the structure to dissipate some of the wave action. The house and system are in a VE flood zone, elevation 14'. Ms. Scott-Pipes: is the rip-rap to protect the leaching field? It is 1' above leaching field. Mr. O'Connell: don't see a cross section of the stone. 3,000 lb stone. Can't support this type of revetment. In this particular case once you build one, you will scour abutters. There are 8 pile supported structures in a row, therefore would impact the other properties; doesn't meet the performance standards. No details of height or length. Mrs. Blaney: if not rip-rap, what other things can we do. Creating a mound with beach cobble is acceptable. Mr. Shea: Part of the Title V approval? No. Stands by itself as far as Title V is concerned. Mr. Blaney: 1 out of 2 pits is functioning. Continue and come back with something. Rosemary Dobie: if they are required to put more cobble, will they be allowed to put back on the beach? Can't design, suggesting cobble could take the place of the large stone. Mr. Snow: large stones are not allowed in this area; Commission could issue maintenance orders. Motion to continue the hearing to July 18, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Tufts. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: McKenney, 11 Franklin St (new deck with ramp/ remove shed, shower, deck & stairs)

Bob Crawford, E.E.T., Inc., was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. This afternoon was presented with structural detail and proposed ramp, but it was discovered to be

different from the existing plans. Remove existing deck, shower & shed. 19-1/2' by an average of 27' and 45' x 4' ramp landing system on the east side. Entire lot lies in the outer riparian zone of the South River, FEMA elevation 10'. Four sonotubes, 16" with big foot, sandwiched in between septic and outside of leaching chambers on right side. All hand dug because of the septic system. When Mr. Crawford did survey work, shed and shower were there. Motion to close the hearing Mr. Greenbaum. Second Ms. Scott-Pipes. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: LeBlanc, 147R Glades Rd (septic repair)  
Greg Morse, Morse Engineering, was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Septic repair for a 3-bedroom dwelling. Wetlands delineated by Brad Holmes. Entire site is within 100' buffer and flood zone AE, elevation 11. Rerouting plumbing, 1,000 gal pump chamber, only area that it can fit on the property. Squeezed it in as best we could. Leaching field 46' off wetland line. DEP is in the process of approving a variance; 3' above groundwater; aerobic treatment system. Ms. Scott-Pipes: don't know where else he'd put the system. Received variance from town. Frank King, 151R Glades Rd.: Existing system is partly on my land--removing existing systems? Existing house encroaches onto 12' wide passageway. Fill with sand and disconnect from house. Property marker will remain. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Tufts. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Brennan, 4 Oceanside Dr (rebuild deck on new footings)  
Tom Brennan was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Filed this Notice of Intent after a positive determination for an RDA. Allowed to start construction due to planned wedding. Looking for more of an overview plan and resources. Land subject to coastal storm flowage. Mr. Greenbaum: 6 sonotubes on plans, but 8 at the site. Six across the front. Update the drawing. What are you doing with the concrete? Removing off site. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Town of Scituate/DPW, Stockbridge Rd Public

Right-of-Way (resource delineation)

Amanda Crouch Smith, Horsley Witten Group, was present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Flagged in 2007, small pocket of isolated wetland, all other BVW. 2200 linear ft. Edge of lawn was pretty much consistent with wetland line. Mr. Shea checked the line and approved wetland line only. Wetland edge is good for 3 years. Northwest of Stockbridge and Vinal Ave., there is a mapped Vernal pool. Motion to close the hearing Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Jones. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Wetlands Hearing: Farina, 10, 12 Ocean Drive, 24 Humarock Beach (install boulders)

John Farina, Sr. & Jr. and Rick Grady, Grady Consulting, were present at the hearing. Abutters notification was submitted. Two existing homes with erosion problem. Existing steps lead down to the beach. Would like to restore the grade based on marks on existing stairs. And install rip- rap boulders 1-1/2 to 1 slope. Mr. O'Connell: not a coastal bank, it is a coastal dune; can't armor a coastal dune--doesn't meet state or local performance standards; dunes must be able to move with wind and wave. Would like to come up with more of a permanent solution. They have been doing general maintenance to replace some of the sand that was lost. Replaced slope 4 times. This will be the 5th. Would like to sit down with Jim to find a more permanent solution. Mr. Snow: Jim is expert in dealing with coastal matters, but also can't impact abutters or the resource. We realize you want to protect your property. Mr. Farina, thinks being singled out. Can't design the project for you. Motion to continue hearing to July 18, 2011 at 6:30 p.m. Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Received Land Grant for Crosbie.

Order of Conditions: Wall, 12 Oceanside Dr (rebuild deck/repair garage)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr. Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Order of Conditions: Kirby, 2 Oceanside Dr (replace open deck)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr.

Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Order of Conditions: MacDonnell, 292 Central Ave. (rip-rap)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr.

Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Order of Conditions: McLaughlin, 234, 238, 240 Central Ave. (rip-rap)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr.

Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

Order of Conditions: Brennan, 4 Oceanside Dr (rebuild deck on new footings)

Motion to condition the project Ms. Scott-Pipes. Second Mr.

Greenbaum. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

#### CORRESPONDENCE

May 24, 2011 – June 13, 2011

1. Recording of OofC for 68-2309 – 230 Central Ave. (in file)
2. Coastal Services Magazine
3. Request for Superseding Order of Conditions for Wannop, Lot 2 Glades Rd 68-2290 (in file)
4. Recording of OofC for 68-2322 – 20 Jericho Rd (in file)
5. MassWildlife News
6. Plan for Minot Beach Parking Lot – note on plan: Parking lot being raised by 3 to 4 inches (in file)
7. Neil Duggan re: Pier 44 Addition – Stop work re: demolition of greenhouse and construction of new addition
8. Recording of OofC 68-2232 – 28 Dartmouth St – 68-2232 – Amendment (in file)
9. Recording of OofC 68-2327 – 71 Surfside Rd (in file)
10. Revised plans for 8 Bonnie Briar Circle – 5/27/11 – Reconfigure SAS, add variance (TM) in file
11. Mass Congress of Lake & Pond Associations, Inc. Newsletter
12. Kleinfelder re: Submittal of Class B-1 Response Action Outcome Statement (RAO) – 157 First Parish Dr
13. Keefe Associates (received by e-mail) re: 2 Cliff Rd – Examined disposal system – no obvious signs of damage.
14. Request for CofC for 68-1719 – 75 River St (in file)

15. Revised plans for 83 Surfside Rd. Removed the proposed concrete patios, the larger replaced deck has been added. (in file)
16. NSRWA Dues notice and article re: reopened selected South River shellfish beds in April.
17. Stormwater Magazine
18. DEP File #68-2328 – Blaney, 274 Central Ave (in file)
19. DEP File #68-2329 – Caspersen, 53 Lighthouse Rd (in file)
20. DEP File #68-2330 – Farina, 1 & 12 Ocean Dr & 24 Humarock Beach (in file)
21. DEP File #68-2331 – MacDonnell, 292 Central Ave. (in file)
22. DEP File #68-2332 – Joy, 262 Central Ave. (in file)
23. DEP File #68-2333 – Seoane, 172 Gannett Rd (in file)
24. DEP File #68-2334 – LeBlanc, 147R Glades Rd (in file)
25. DEP File #68-2335 – McKenney, 11 Franklin St (in file)
26. DEP File #68-2336 – Town of Scituate/DPW, Stockbridge Rd (in file)
27. DEP File #68-2337 – Frost, 148 Tilden Rd (in file)
28. Revised Plot Plan 6/2/11 for 104 Edward Foster Rd (in file)
29. Request for CofC for 68-2286 – 161 Summer St (in file)
30. Revised plans for 105 Gilson Rd (in file)
31. Revised plans for Boyle, 254 Central Ave. (in file)
32. 10 Peggotty Beach requests permission to remove sand from the parking area of her home. Attached map. Existing Orders (in file)
33. Selectmen deny Emergency Sewer Tie-In for 35 Tilden Rd (in new filing)
34. Request for Superseding OofC for Hallisey – follow-up to site inspection held May 19, 2011 (in file)
35. Northern Construction re: Revetment Reconstruction Project Site B (First Cliff) & C (Second Cliff) – Agreed on construction staging area. Northern will be responsible for any damages (in file)
36. Northern Construction re: Access Agreement for Site B (First Cliff) & C (Second Cliff) – Carey – agreed on an access point. (in file)
37. Notification – Plowing Martha McCarthy, 47 Town Way Extension. (in file)
38. DPW – Ocean Debris Clean-up Policy. 1. Remove seaweed, etc. as soon as possible after a storm; 2. Prior to opening public beaches will remove debris from public swimming areas; 3. Will not clean beyond the limits of the publicly guarded beaches; 4. Between nominally 3rd

week in June through Labor Day, beach will not be maintained. 5. Not able to clean public beaches due to accessibility issues.

39. EPA – NOI for Storm Water – Tilden Woods, LLC, 77 Elm St (in file)

40. DEP –68-2290 – On-Site Scheduled for FRI., JUNE 24, 2011 at 10:00 A.M. Wannop, Lot 2 Glades Rd (in file)

41. The Beacon

42. Request for continuance 147A Border St (in file)

43. Kessinger re: 68-2321 – Amending the project description for the NOI to remove the request to pave any portion of the property located at 154 Jericho Rd. Enclosed pages 1 & 2. Withdraw the amendment previously filed on May 23, 2011. (in file)

44. Liaison positions/BOS – Richard W. Murray for Conservation

45. DCR – Potential Hazard Mitigation Grant Applicants.

46. MACC Dues = \$448.00

Meeting adjourned 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Logue, Secretary